

C. 1900

WITH THE COMPLIMENTS

—OF—

PRINCIPAL GRANT.

L
LE3.Q9G7U

THE UNIVERSITY QUESTION.

IN an interview with the Editor of the *Toronto Star* the other day, I gave a brief statement of this question from our point of view, because that in the circumstances seemed chiefly required. It will not be out of place to reproduce that statement here, although—thanks to the courtesy of the Press, more particularly and naturally in Eastern Ontario—it has been widely circulated in whole or in part. It contained some printer's mistakes which it is as well to correct, and—seeing that it had to be very brief and to be confined to our point of view, it was of necessity inadequate, as a presentation of the case. What the ordinary intelligent man wants to know is, not what is the interest of this, or that person, place or sect, but what is for the interest of the Province as a whole at the present time, what our educational condition implies, and what a sense of justice demands. I said, in the City Hall, last May, in my Convocation address, that if the University question was re-opened, a comprehensive measure was called for; that not only should the claims of Toronto University be considered and aid extended to it, but that Queen's had a prior claim which should also be considered. It never occurred to me then that anyone, least of all a University Professor or President, would characterize an Academic address of this kind as "a hold-up" of Toronto University or an "aggression" upon it, which its graduates could with propriety be called on to repel. Such a style of dealing with the higher education of the Province serves no good purpose. It beclouds a question which should be studied calmly and in a serene atmosphere. It irritates the great mass of people outside the narrow circle of University life, so far as they pay any attention to it, because it is an offence to their best instincts. Education is important, not because of its money value, but because—if of the right kind—it develops the spirit in man, the spirit which values literature, science, art, in a word all truth, for its own sake. In the end, that—like godliness—will

be found "profitable unto all things." But when University authorities make money for their own institution the be-all and end-all of their speeches, when they declare that the lack of money for it is the root of all evil, when they express the hope that a millenium is coming when forsooth! Ontario shall have only one University, one Faculty of Medicine,—why not also one Faculty of Science, one Institute of Technology, one Normal School, one Art School, and one factory,—no one is profited, least of all the one University. They are sacrificing the best interests of the country, which demand free development of the human spirit, even more than the development of its material resources, to a theory too small for actual—let alone prospective—conditions, and they are disregarding rights which a generous mind would be prompt to appreciate.

I have always had a high sense of the importance and the possibilities of the University of Toronto. Thirty years ago, in the Province of Nova Scotia, I pointed it out publicly to my friends as a model for us in a small Province to imitate. Twenty-three years ago, in my inaugural address at Queen's, I praised the policy which—when the Province was young, poor, and destitute of secondary schools,—gave all the public land set apart for University purposes to one institution, because that ensured not only a well-equipped University from the outset, but also with regard to others the survival only of the fittest and the certainty that they too would have to attain to a high standard before receiving recognition. It must be confessed, on the other side, that the attitude of some of those who have at times posed as the representatives of the Provincial University has not been attractive. They have proved that a State University may have the defects of a State Church, and thus that instead of being a unifying it may be a disrupting force, and that very drastic changes may be required before an adequate and ideal educational position is reached. But whatever the result or the changes that may be made, let the discussion of the question be dignified, and let us try to reach common ground.

As statesmen deal not with fancies, but with actual conditions, let us ask what is the state of the case, as it appears to the friends of Queen's?

"In Kingston is a university, operated for more than half a

century under Royal charter—the same authority as that under which Toronto now acts—with land, buildings, and revenue representing more than a million dollars, voluntarily contributed for the noblest public ends. This university does almost the whole university work of Eastern Ontario, while it attracts students from the Dominion generally. On account of the sectarian attitude of the province in the thirties and forties of this century, it was originated by the Presbyterian Church, on the model of Edinburgh University, and was from the first “open to all on the same terms.”

RECENT ACTION.

It has been practically undenominational for twenty-five years, for the Church having ceased then to appoint any of its Board of Management and Control, the Board felt that it represented the public and acted as guardians of a public trust. The Board has become convinced that it is its duty to make the university as national by statute as it has been national in practice. The Supreme Court of the Church has unanimously assented to the principle of the Board's proposal. The graduates, benefactors and corporators have also unanimously assented to the change and to the creation of a new corporation which shall fully represent its public character. The Board, therefore, asks the Government to take such share in the management of the university as it may consider necessary; to co-operate financially—in accordance with British practice in dealing with universities and university colleges—so that its work may be still more beneficial to the public; and to inaugurate in connection with it an annual public audit.

Can the Government and Legislature refuse such request, in view of the principles on which they have acted with regard to other educational institutions? Our educational system is conducted on this principle of Governmental co-operation with public bodies and independent boards. The principle applies to common schools, secondary schools, the recently established “continuation classes,” and the still more recently established technical departments in several Collegiate Institutes.

Two important college cases may be cited:

- I. In 1892-3 a number of gentlemen in different counties of Eastern Ontario subscribed \$35,000 for a school of mining and

agriculture. The municipality of Kingston gave them a handsome property, worth \$25,000, to aid the project. The school has been such a success that the Government at the request of the Dairymen's Association has taken over the dairy school, and it gives \$13,500 a year to the mining department. The mining school has already some seventy regular students and three or four times that number taking partial courses.

2. By the unanimous vote of the Legislature last session, Upper Canada College, regarded previously in public Acts as an integral part of Toronto University, was transferred to an independent board, contingent on its friends subscribing \$50,000 for its extension. Yesterday that Act of the Legislature was formally consummated. Questions may be asked here: (a) If three or four hundred thousand dollars of public property are given to a board, in virtue of promises of \$50,000, from two or three hundred rich men, how much should be given to a board which has raised a million from ten thousand subscribers, very few of whom are wealthy? (b) If public liberality on such a scale is extended to an institution in Toronto, doing secondary school work, in competition with three Collegiate Institutes doing similar work in the same city, what treatment should be given to a university which serves the needs of a large and distinct section of the province, and has provided higher education for hundreds—or thousands—who without it would never have received any college training? (c) If an institution receives provincial aid, which has never been recognized by municipalities, though they have been encouraged for 50 years by the Municipal Act to do so, how should the province deal with an institution which has been aided directly and indirectly by municipal grants, and to which the ratepayers of Kingston voted \$50,000, six months after the law was changed to allow them to vote money for such a purpose? (d) If so much public assistance can be rightly given for the education of rich men's sons, how much should be given to a university with more than half the number of undergraduates* in arts that Toronto University

*In December, 1899, the *Globe* published the following statement alleged to be official, of the number of students in Arts, for sessions 1898, 1899, and 1900, in the combined University of Toronto and Victoria:—

In 1898, 870
1899, 762
1900, 725

has,—over sixty per cent. of whom come from the homes of our farmers and mechanics?

The principle of legislative co-operation is thus recognized all through the piece. How can the Government refuse to apply the principle to what is admittedly the greatest educational institution in the Province, with the possible exception of the University of Toronto?

WILL OTHERS APPLY?

A question in the form of objection may be asked on the other side. If Queen's is aided, will not other universities apply? The answer is that, according to the report of the Education Department, there are only two educational centres doing university work in Ontario which the department and the public recognize, viz., Toronto and Kingston. In Toronto the province has established, by the Confederation Act, a university professoriate, which greatly aids several colleges in the city, and which is equally open to all colleges and universities in the city. It is asked, in justice to the east, to do the same in Kingston; not at the same cost, for while the universities in Toronto do 79 per cent. of the work required by our secondary schools, Queen's does only 20 per cent., although its proportion is steadily growing relatively to the others. No university in Ontario, outside of Toronto and Kingston, gives a single graduate to our secondary school system. One per cent. is contributed by Manitoba, Harvard, McGill and Great Britain combined.

Therefore, no other university in Ontario is in a position to apply, and it will take any other from twenty to fifty years' hard work to reach the position of Queen's. By that time Ontario

For the same years, the number in Queen's was—

In 1898, 407

1899, 430

1900, 433

Fully a hundred of our students are "extra murals"; that is men—chiefly teachers—who cannot attend classes but who are kept in constant touch with the work under tutorial supervision, try the exercises, write the essays, and pass the examinations. This is the class which London University in England was mainly intended to reach; with this difference that—so far as I know—London gives them no aid by means of University tutors. In the *Globe* of Dec. 18th last, the numbers for the session 1901 are given, and the matriculated are distinguished from the non-matriculated students. Only the former are undergraduates, for they alone have taken the necessary preliminary examination, and they alone should count. It appears that in Toronto and Victoria combined there are now 611 of these; and as Victoria must have 150, that would make between four and five hundred for Toronto. Queen's this session has four hundred, who have passed the same public examination, 115 of them "extra-murals."

will have as large a population as Scotland ; and Scotland, when it had not half the present population of Ontario, possessed four universities, every one of them with professors of European reputation ; obliged to "cultivate literature on a little oatmeal," because the greedy Barons appropriated the land which John Knox would have given to parish schools, grammar schools, and universities. The farmers, merchants, mechanics, and manufacturers of Ontario will not prove as greedy as the Scottish Barons in the days of Knox. The objection that others will at once apply for Provincial aid, should Queen's be aided, is therefore not valid."

To this extract I ought to add, in all fairness, that it is to be hoped the time will come when others will be in a position to apply. A fetish may be made of number two, as well as of the sacred number one. No person has a right to dictate beforehand how many the country needs. England had only Oxford and Cambridge, when the Queen came to the throne. Though these two have been greatly extended since, they are still admittedly far from complete. The number however has increased to seven, and it is evident that in time Knox's ideal, "a university for every principal city" or section of the country, will be reached in England. There is no difficulty in deciding what universities should be aided, if there is any public conscience in Ontario ; and if there is not, something more radical is needed than "One university, with allied denominational universities,—but all in one place." That cry may suit the exigencies of some, but it is a poor cry, and not a policy on which statesmen can stand. It may be noted that the British commissioners of the 1851 exhibition, once they had decided to establish Fellowships worth £150 stg. a year in connection with British and Colonial universities, had no difficulty in finding which, at present, are worthy of the honour. They recognised two in Ontario, Toronto and Queen's, and two in the rest of Canada. Our vision ought to be as true as theirs ; and if we cannot trust our own vision, we can act on theirs as a precedent. It ought surely to be clear that "in a matter of this kind every institution must stand on its own merits. If the record of Queen's justifies a Government grant, that does not entail assistance to others with inferior claims. If Queen's is unworthy of a grant, that should not exclude others with adequate claims."

IS QUEEN'S DENOMINATIONAL?

Having considered the objection that "others might apply," a second objection which has been urged deserves to be noted. The Denominational bogey has been invoked, in spite of the history of Queen's, its reputation where it is best known, and the fact that public money is not expected until the University is separated in name as well as in reality from the Church with which from its origin it has been so honourably connected. This change in its Constitution has not been proposed and discussed for the purpose of getting aid from the State. It comes about as the result of the evolution of the University into a larger life than that which its Constitution expresses. It calls for the separation of the Theological Faculty, and its affiliation as an independent corporation to the University, because no Church is yet prepared to treat Theology as a science. Possibly, in the twenty-first century, Denominationalism will be considered as unworthy of Theology as it is now considered unworthy of Literature, Philosophy or Science, but the good time coming will not be hastened by ostentatiously ignoring or unwisely protesting against actual conditions. What has the whole history of Queen's been but a long struggle against the sectarianism of the Province in various forms! Queen's came into existence in 1841, because the Provincial University was sectarian. Fifteen years later, it had to form a Medical Faculty, because medical students in Toronto could not get degrees, without submitting to sectarian tests. Subsequently, it had to do the same for women, because Canadian women had to expatriate themselves in order to become qualified as medical missionaries. As neither its charter, statutes, nor by-laws referred to sex, for there is no sex in mind any more than in the good, the beautiful and the true, no difficulty in this regard was ever raised in Queen's, whereas the doors of the Provincial University were opened only when the scandal of women refused admission, though winners of Matriculation Scholarships and obliged to forfeit their Scholarships and come to Queen's, made the injustice too glaring to be longer endured. In these and other ways the Province has benefitted educationally, and the Provincial University has benefitted, by the existence of its sister in the East. Those things are not mentioned for the sake of glorying, but to point to the dangers inevitably connected with monopoly

in the region of the mind. Nothing more surely cramps, deadens and sectarianizes the spiritual. Monopoly may be good in the production, manufacture, transportation and distribution of material things. In connection with the human spirit, it is always hurtful, and possibly deadly to our highest interests. Secarianism, let us never forget, does not inhere in an institution, but in the mind. Cast it out in one form, and it appears in another and probably a more insidious form; and it is often worst, where most vehemently protested against. Have we an illustration of this in the fact that those who call aloud that Queen's is denominational, with therefore no claim on the Province, see no objection to the State allying itself with confessedly strictly denominational universities like Victoria or Trinity; the Church doing one half of the public work leading to an Arts Degree, the State doing the other half, and a division of subjects made to suit ecclesiastical and personal preferences?

A THIRD OBJECTION.

There is another objection with which I have a certain sympathy, because springing from a patriotic desire it appeals to us as Canadians. We are told that a new conception of universities is now current in the United States; that the minimum annual expenditure for a modern University is a quarter of a million, with at least a million in buildings and equipment; that Toronto has only half that sum, and must have the other half, if it is to compete with the creation of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Mr. Ezra Cornell or Mr. Leland Stanford; and that Ontario is too poor to have more than one University, if indeed it is rich enough to afford one. So penetrated with this conviction is a distinguished gentleman who has made Toronto his home that he mourns over the existence of McGill. The money of rich English-speaking Montrealers would have been spent to so much better purpose in Toronto! and as for people speaking French, who cares for them? That seems to me to be the *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole argument. It need scarcely be said that every intelligent man admits the importance of endowments for research, of scientific knowledge applied to every industry, and of provision for post-graduate work. All that will come. It has come to a certain extent already, but it will not come more quickly or surely by massing the under-graduates of Canada or

even of Ontario in one centre. They can not or they will not go, and that ought to end the matter. It will not come by ignoring the fact that liberal culture for hundreds and thousands of under-graduates is more important to the State than expensive provision for units. Again, Ontario is not poor. Even if it were, the great work to which it should be summoned is not to engage in a vulgar competition with the multi-millionaires of the United States. It will rather attend to its own business, study its own conditions, and do its own work. Let the potsherd strive with the potsherds of the earth; but let people with a soul seek higher if less pretentious victories than those which money can give and take away. The plea of Ontario's poverty is discreditable. Her people are richer on the average than Scotchmen, while her potential resources are far greater. The Government of the mother country, bearing all the burdens of the Empire and the accumulated entail of a thousand years of struggle, gives \$360,000 a year to the four Universities of Scotland, besides a grant to the University College of Dundee; and no money from the public exchequer yields so high a rate of interest. Ontario has already more than half the population of Scotland, and—according to the British basis and method—it would pay her to spend, judiciously and gradually, \$200,000 a year on the various departments of University work within her borders. The University of Toronto, we are told by its highest authority, is "intensely British." It will surely then follow British precedents rather than those set by raw Western States. According to the highest estimates, it needs \$50,000 a year more than it now gets; even if that sum were given, a handsome margin would be left for Queen's, not to speak of other Universities and Institutes of Technology, which are sure to grow up in connection with the healthy growth of a Province that has within it the elements as well as the extent of a nation.

What then is the University question? It is, in the first place, whether facts shall be recognized and justice done to Queen's? The parents, the secondary schools, and, generally speaking, the press and all interested in the higher education of Eastern Ontario, recognize Queen's as their University. Within the last twenty years, Kingston—by individual donations and the cordial vote of all classes to tax themselves for its extension

—has contributed to it \$150,000. The Department of Education has for years publicly recognized its work as on the same level with that of the University of Toronto. Can the Government and Legislature, charged with the high duty of educating the people and elected to deal out even-handed justice to the whole Province, refuse to recognize these facts? It cannot. In one way or another, sooner or later, they must be recognized. Queen's can afford to wait, because—founded on wholesome Scottish traditions—it lives on its income and declines to run into debt. We seek the co-operation of the Province in our work, simply for its extension; to meet the expansion of the country, the promise of the new century and the resistless demands of the human intellect.

The University question is, in the second place, whether our higher education, which in the long run moulds and inspires our whole system, shall be encouraged to develop freely, in accordance with its own laws and the life of the people, or whether it shall be cribbed, cabined and confined by the arbitrary theory that there should be only one University in Ontario? This theory means, when reduced to its underlying principle, that no other University has a moral right to exist, and that it would be a blessing to the people, if the earth opened its mouth and swallowed the others up, as happened to Korah, Dathan and Abiram, when they spake against Moses. As at bottom it means this, the answer to the second question is as inevitable as the answer to the first.

G. M. GRANT,

Principal of Queen's.

REFLECTIONS ON UNIVERSITY MONOPOLY.

AMONG the numerous questions which arise in connection with the future of university education in Ontario is one as to the wisdom of attempting to stamp the whole of the higher educational life of the Province with one die. In all the efforts of men to provide for themselves the means and instruments of life, the utmost economy and efficiency in organization, with concentration of knowledge and skill, resulting in the maximum of product for the minimum of human effort, is altogether admissible. It may be summed up in the economic ideal of the greatest possible concentration in production and the greatest possible diffusion of products. In other words, it is the height of wisdom to get the means of life in enlarging quantity, while we redeem an increasing portion of life from mere bondage to its own instruments. But, when it comes to a question of the aims and ideals which inspire life, and for whose realization alone the vast economic resources placed at our command have meaning, we are at once on different ground. We are no longer dealing with means to an end, but with the end itself. This is not to be cramped, abbreviated, robbed of its individuality, and reduced to a characterless series of indistinguishable units turned out by a great centralized machine shop, however splendidly equipped or systematically organized on a basis of minute division of labour.

It is undoubtedly the higher purpose of a true university training to open up before the youth of the country a broader and fuller view of the possibilities of life than is to be had from the mere pursuit of any calling or trade, however indispensable we know this to be. Indeed it is just because the various occupations of life admit either of a generous and self-realizing treatment, or of a narrowing, almost self-obliterating pursuit, that so much depends upon this larger and freer treatment which university teaching, among other agencies, makes possible, immediately to the body of students and through them, in varying degrees, to the rest of the community. But inasmuch as this implies the awakening of subtle spiritual powers, the educating or drawing out to consciousness in the individual of those capacities and aspirations which lie dormant within him,

no hard and fast system can be prescribed for the accomplishment of this end.

All forms of educational monopoly and stereotyping are fatal to that spirit of freedom, alertness and expectation which must characterize a progressive civilization, in which the achievements of the present and the aspirations of the future, though in close touch with the past, are ever going beyond it.

If the government of a rich province like Ontario is to confine its assistance to one type of university centre there must result a tendency, not unnoticed even now, to breed in the public mind the idea that there is but one normal type of university organization and education, and that all others are to be despised. Should this tendency reach its logical maturity, there ceases to be any choice as to the medium of a higher education for nine out of ten of the youth of the Province. With no option there is no discussion of methods, comparison of results, or stimulus to variety and independence of thought at the very stage of intellectual development when these are almost everything.

For a university centre enjoying a monopoly of government aid and educational control, it is but the natural consequence of anything but genius that there should result a relaxing self-complacency, the inbreeding of a close corporation, self-glorification without and petty intriguing within, and many other symptoms of decay.

No intelligent person, it may be hoped, will object to ample provision being made from the funds of the Province for the equipment of a thoroughly organized university system in Toronto. But in the very interest of that system as insuring its spiritual vitality, it is surely reasonable to claim that the Provincial Government should aid at least another type of university centre, such as that at Kingston, so long as it proves itself worthy of support and intrinsically capable of giving and receiving stimulus in connection with the purely state university. By aiding a university which, though independent in management and relying chiefly upon private benefactions, yet is entirely devoted to the higher education of the country, the government of the Province would share in the credit due to its work, and prove its sympathy with that independence and freedom in intellectual matters, which is the very essence of all true education.

A. SHORTT.

